

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER, AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

VOL. III.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 4, 1834.

NO. 10.

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN NEW-YORK
AND PHILADELPHIA.

EDITED BY

T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas and P. Price.

P. PRICE, PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS.—Two Dollars per ann. in advance, or \$2.50 if not paid within six months. Publishing offices No. 2 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, (foot of the Bowery) New-York, and No. 132 Chesnut-street, Philadelphia.

Letters to be addressed, (post paid) "P. Price, No. 2 Chatham-Square, New-York."

STATEMENT OF FACTS.

Relative to the attack made on Universalism by the Rev. Dr. Brownlee, and the late editorial conduct of the Christian Intelligencer; addressed to the members of the Reformed Dutch Church.

CHRISTIAN FRIENDS—I am sensible of the humble estimation in which the holy cause, which it is my honor, as well as my happiness to advocate, is generally held. I am aware that its friends are sometimes met with abuse, and sometimes treated with contempt. Yet the fact that the opposition we are doomed to encounter, is chiefly to be ascribed to the clergy, emboldens me to hope that an appeal to you, the laity, will be received with candor. Let me ask you to lay aside whatever prejudice you may entertain against Universalists or their doctrines, so far as may be necessary to a patient hearing, and an impartial judgement relative to the facts which I am about to lay before you.

It is now something more than a year since the Rev. Dr. Brownlee commenced a course of Lectures against Universalism. The reputation which he sustains, and the influence he exerts in the religious affairs of New-York, gave an importance to the subject, which it had not before been generally supposed to possess. There was novelty too in a course of Lectures on Universalism. With the exception of the Rev. Joel Parker, no clergyman of New-York had attempted any thing of the kind, so far as I am acquainted, for many years. But Mr. Parker was almost unknown in the city, occupied a small place, I think, in Thames-street, and excited no attention. His Lectures had been previously delivered in Rochester, and were then in press, or already published at that place. The reason of his repeating them in New-York is not known, but it might have been done with a reference to their sale, rather than from a conviction that local circumstances required them.

The Lectures of Dr. Brownlee, therefore, possessed all the charm of novelty to most of his auditors, and at the same time marked the progress of Universalism in New-York. The public attention was excited, and many, no doubt, will date the commencement of their investigations of this momentous subject, with his labors. You were all, I presume, led to inquire what circumstances called forth this attack on a denomination which you had ever been taught to look upon as unworthy of notice, and whose opinions were so very absurd as to need no refutation! And you could hardly fail of concluding that whatever had hitherto been the condition of this despised faith, it was now rising into notice and consequently becoming more or less dangerous, inasmuch as it claimed the public at-

tention of one of the first lights in your church. It is unnecessary to say that Universalists felt a gratification in contemplating the scene that opened before them. They were acquainted with Dr. Brownlee's reputation. They indulged a strong confidence in his candor—a candor which they hoped would be sufficient when truth required

'To blame a friend and give a foe man praise.'

An expression of these feelings may be seen in the Christian Messenger, Vol. II, No. 1, to which the reader is referred.

Soon after the delivery of his first Lecture, I called on Dr. Brownlee, to make inquiries relative to its publication. I was informed by him that it was the first of a course—that some time must necessarily elapse before their completion—and that their publication had not been a subject of consideration. He had been requested to take up the subject of Universalism, he said, and knew not but he had already delayed it too long. An ardent desire was expressed on my part that the Lectures should be laid before the public—the subject was important and if we were unfortunately in error, it certainly became the duty of those in the truth to correct us.

Some time had elapsed, and I was informed that his Lectures were drawing to a close. After consulting with many of my society, and with their unanimous approbation of the measure, I invited Dr. Brownlee to repeat his whole course in the Orchard-st. Church. It was hoped that he would accept the invitation—and that Universalists might have the opportunity of listening to an examination of their distinguishing doctrine in their own Church, where all might attend and where every objection which learning or talents could produce should be urged by one of the first theologians in the city. But our motives will perhaps be better understood from my note of invitation. It follows.

NEW YORK, Dec 14th, 1832.

Rev. and Dear Sir—

Having been informed that your Course of Lectures against Universalism, is now nearly completed, I take the liberty of respectfully inviting you to repeat it in the Orchard-st. Church, where I have the honor statedly to minister. And I do this with the more readiness and pleasure because I realize the great importance justly attached to a frank and candid discussion of the question which has engaged your attention—a question, I cannot but add, which is deserving the most serious and prayerful consideration of every man, and especially of every christian on earth. For myself, and I think I speak the sentiments of every member of my congregation, I have no interest in being deceived on any subject, and least of all on this. If I am in error, and know my own heart, I should acknowledge that man my benefactor who would kindly point out my error and guide me into the way of truth and life. And you will not think it flattery, when I say that if there is any man in New York who is able to convince Universalists, it is yourself. Your acknowledged learning and talents point you out as a most proper person to show both myself and congregation, that our distinguishing doctrine is consistent neither with reason nor revelation.

It is unnecessary, I trust, to suggest the various considerations of christian duty, which must incite you to endeavors to expose what you consider to be the fatal delusions of Universalism. Could you be the instrument of awaking but one soul from its

lethargy and thereby rescuing it from the unutterable wretchedness to which you believe us all exposed, an eternity of obligation and thanks would be your reward.

Permit me to add that should you find it consistent with your other duties to accept my invitation, my desk will be at your service when it suits your convenience. Sunday evenings, I might remark, however, would probably best accommodate both myself and my congregation and friends, of whom I will promise you a full attendance.

With sentiments of high respect and consideration, I subscribe myself, yours, &c.

THOMAS J. SAWYER.

W. C. Brownlee, D. D.

I need not stop to remark on the obvious fact that such an invitation to such a man, bespoke no fear of truth. If any man in the community was capable of exposing the fallacy of Universalism, it was supposed to be Dr. Brownlee. Yet we did not fear to see even him in our own desk for this avowed purpose; we did not fear, because we knew that if our faith was based in truth, it could not be shaken; if in falsehood, it could not be shaken and destroyed too soon. But while such an opportunity was offered to expose error and diffuse and confirm the truth, could you have believed, christian friends, that it should be declined? Here was a whole congregation, involved as you believe in fatal error! A door was opened for their conversion, yet, the truth must be told, it was shunned by the very man who should have been the first to avail himself of this opportunity to advance his Master's cause! I should feel that I was exposing myself to your censure, were I here to omit Dr. Brownlee's reply to the foregoing note. Of the sufficiency of his reasons for declining my invitation, you must individually judge.

Dec. 24, 1832.

Mr. Sawyer,—

Sir—Your favor I received a few days ago, and I ought to have replied sooner.

The reason of my delaying was this: as the pastor of a Collegiate Church, I had to consult my Colleagues, and the Elders of the Church; for it would have been inconsistent with the deference I owe them to enter on this enterprise without consulting them.

My impressions, and my wish, personally, on receiving your kind and courteous letter, was to accept your liberal and truly generous offer.

But, sir, my Colleagues, and every Elder I have consulted have pronounced their *veto*. And it would be taking too much on myself to act contrary to their wishes. I am sure you will admit that, in modesty and deference, I could not do it.

There was another reason: my immense labors in my own charge. You may form a view of my labors, when I tell you that we have upwards of 900 members, and more than 700 families; these must be visited as much as time will permit. And I have usually three discourses, each week to prepare.

There was another consideration,—had I accepted your most generous invitation, I would have been obliged to take up the whole field of debate.—And as my friend, Mr. Sawyer, is also a Unitarian, I could not, perhaps, discuss the question in the same form as if in Mr. Mitchell's church. In a word, I could not have done justice to you, or myself, without giving at least, eight Lectures. And as I am not master of my own time, I must submit to the circumstances which Divine Providence has thrown in my way, and decline your liberal offer.

I may add another reason; I have been heavily

drawn on, by the different churches up town. In no less than four Churches have I been engaged as one of the *stated Lecturers*. And I have been three times called upon to deliver my Lectures on Universalism. Last evening I delivered the 2d in my course, in Rutgers Presb. Church.

I hope I have satisfied you, that it is not want of inclination,—but really want of time which urges on me the necessity of declining.

Finally, I have to state that next Sabbath evening I shall, if God permit me, enter on the defence of our own doctrine, viz. *That the curse resting on the finally impenitent is not disciplinary, but punishment properly so called; and in the strictest sense unlimited in duration.*

I shall always be glad to see you, and shall when I have a leisure hour, endeavor to see you.

With the greatest respect, I am, Mr. Sawyer, your obedient servant. W. C. BROWNLEE.

Rev. Mr. Sawyer.

The hope expressed by Dr. Brownlee in the preceding note that he had satisfied me it was 'not want of inclination, but really want of time' which made it necessary for him to decline my invitation, was not realized. I probably looked upon the subject in a different light from what he did, and consequently, that which was satisfactory to him, was not so to me. I knew that he believed all Universalists to be in manifest danger of suffering endless misery, and that the only hope for our salvation, was connected with the hope that we might be converted from our errors! Here was a respectable congregation, ready to listen to his strongest reasons in favor of what he deemed truth. What was his duty? To heed the *veto* of his friends? "Modesty and deference" might require it, but did the cause of God require it? What! was it for him to stand and see souls go down to hell, and not put forth one effort to save them! But his colleagues and elders had put their *veto* upon his exertions. My God! and was his commission from colleagues and elders, or from Jesus Christ? My christian friends, will you contemplate this subject in candor; cast your thoughts forward to the great day of final doom; imagine you there see me and my congregation, on the left hand of the awful Judge: At whose hands shall our blood be required? We erred, but erred honestly. We called upon one of the professed ambassadors of Christ to correct us, but he turned us away with an *apology*—an *excuse*! His brethren, the ministers and elders of the church of God, had, like the Jews of old, forbidden him to speak to us, that we might be saved! Had we been pagans, on the other side of the globe, how would the hearts of christians have warmed at the prospect. Your sympathies would have been appealed to, and contributions levied to send the gospel to us at every expense and every hazard. But in our own city, how different the scene! Here, those whom your creed dooms to everlasting torments, may live, and wander, and die, unheeded;—nay, congregations may open their very temples, and invite your clergy to occupy the place of their teachers, and with all the certainty of your faith before you, that they will finally perish, you pass them, like the Priest and the Levite, on the other side.

I may repeat, I was not satisfied with the reasons which Dr. Brownlee accumulated for declining. I was not satisfied, that the *veto* of his colleagues and elders, was at all indicative of a christian spirit in them, nor was I satisfied that it had any bearing upon Dr. Brownlee's duty as a minister of Jesus Christ. I was not satisfied that his "immense labors" were of such a character that they could not be dispensed with a few Sunday evenings, while he repeated his Lectures in my church. I was not satisfied that it was necessary for him "to take up the whole field," and prove the doctrine of the Trinity, in order to disprove Universalism, and establish endless misery. Nor was I satisfied that the fact of his being 'heavily drawn on' up town, was sufficient to justify him in declining my invitation. He had been three times called upon to repeat his Lectures. With two of these calls, he certainly complied. But before whom did he repeat them? Before congregations already established in the doctrine of endless misery—nominally so at least: and who were, therefore, in little need of his instruction on the subject. With us, in his opinion,

it must have been altogether otherwise. We were in darkness, and in the shadow of death. But I need not pursue the subject. You will re-peruse Dr. Brownlee's letter and judge of its propriety.

A few days after the reception of the above letter, I forwarded a second note to the following purpose:

Rev. and Dear Sir—

Dec. 27, 1832.

Yours of the 24th inst. was duly and gratefully received. I have reason to regret that circumstances made it necessary for you to decline my invitation. Allow me, however, to ask one favor more at your hands. Will you have the goodness to furnish me a copy of your lectures against universalism? I have the sketches of them as given in the "Christian Intelligencer." I have also notes taken by a friend, who listened to you in the Rutgers-street church. Judging from these, I think you have very much misapprehended the general opinions of universalists, and have consequently done them injustice. And I feel it to be my duty to correct, as far as possible, the erroneous impressions I think you have made upon the public mind. In this attempt, however, I wish to be correctly informed, that in endeavoring to repel injustice, I might not be unjust myself. Could you therefore furnish me in any way with a full copy of your Lectures, you would lay both myself, and the denomination to which I have the happiness to belong, under high obligations.

An early answer will be thankfully acknowledged. With the greatest respect,

W. C. BROWNLEE, D. D.

To this note, I received the following reply.

Jan. 5, 1833.

Mr. Sawyer,—

Dear Sir—Your favors were duly received. The card enclosing tickets for the concert, I did not receive until my return home from Brooklyn, which was after ten in the evening; of course I could not avail myself of them and your politeness.

My avocations at this season of the year, are truly pressing. It is the time when we visit our families. And you may form some idea of our activity and labor, when I tell you that on Wednesday last, in company with two of my colleagues, I visited nearly 30 families, say 77. On Thursday, 64, &c. &c.

In reply to yours, relative to my notes of the sermons on universalism, I beg leave to say, that it seems to me, next to an impossibility, to furnish them. I use Graham's short hand. This renders them, in their present state, to you *unintelligible*. And I could not pretend to write them out in a legible hand, such as a printer required, within less than two weeks; I mean to say, it would cost me two weeks hard labor to write them out. And to me, what is, or can be, more irksome, than the transcription of MS.?

From this, I must beg leave, therefore, to be excused,—for to me, this difficulty is next to a *physical impossibility*. I cannot encounter it now.

My last discourse, probably, or last but one, will be pronounced on the 3rd. Sabbath of January, in the Middle Church.

In haste—I am Yours, Truly, &c.

W. C. BROWNLEE.

I was now cut off from all hope of either listening to his Lectures, or obtaining a copy in any way, from his own hand. He was busily engaged in repeating them in two or three different churches in the city, and nothing was left but to commence a reply on the authority of the Christian Intelligencer, in which they were reported. This I did, sometimes taking an argument or an insinuation, from private notes taken by a friend. A course of Sunday evening lectures were soon commenced in the Orchard-street church, and a series of letters begun in the Christian Messenger. Of the latter, you can judge for yourselves, for they are before the public. It was my design to review every argument adduced by Dr. Brownlee against universalism, and to explain every important text advanced in favor of his own doctrine.

While my Lectures in reply to those of Dr. Brownlee were in progress, I received from him a letter charging me, on the authority of a clerical friend, with misrepresenting his opinions. This letter was published, as he requested, in the Chris-

tian Messenger, and was the next week answered through the same medium. The misrepresentation, with which I was charged, consisted in an alleged declaration that Dr. Brownlee held, and had expressed in his pulpit the doctrine, *that God had from all eternity designed to make some men merely to damn them!* Such a declaration he utterly disclaimed both for himself and his church. He also denied that it was found on Calvin's pages. Whether my reply was satisfactory, I have never been informed. That correspondence may be found if you wish to refer to it, in the Christian Messenger, Vol. II, Nos. 18 and 19.

In the Lectures of Dr. Browlee, Universalists at least were disappointed. They had looked for candor, but it was not found. Indeed it is seldom we have seen a more abusive attack. They had anticipated argument, but were met with declamation. At almost every step he betrayed a culpable ignorance of the system of faith he assailed. Gross misrepresentation was the consequence. I am not surprised, christian friends, at the opinions you entertain of us. If you believe the unqualified assertions of Dr. Brownlee, my wonder is that you do not tremble for your own lives. It is his opinion that if Universalism should prevail, our country would become a kind of hell! That oaths would no longer be sacred, and of course, every crime might be perpetrated with impunity, and property and reputation and life become the prey of lawless villains!

In the course of my Letters I pointed out numerous instances of misrepresentation, and called upon Dr. Brownlee publicly to correct the errors into which he had fallen. I felt this to be his duty, as a gentleman and a christian. If Universalists are really bad men, there can be no necessity of belying them. Let the truth be told, and however mild the manner, it must bear their condemnation. If their opinions are false, they need no misrepresentation to bring them into disrepute. State their doctrines as they hold them and show community that they are in accordance neither with reason nor revelation. That Dr. Brownlee misrepresented the opinions of Universalists, and grossly, too, I hold myself ready to prove.

Notwithstanding my repeated calls upon the Dr. to retract erroneous assertions he had made, and to correct misrepresentations of which he had been guilty, nothing was heard from him until the latter part of October, when he commenced in the Christian Intelligencer a course of articles entitled, 'ESSAYS ON UNIVERSALISM—New Series.' What constitutes them a new series, I have not been informed. I am not aware that Dr. Brownlee, or indeed any other person, has before presented the public a series of articles on this subject through the same medium. In his introductory Essay, we are told that he enters on this enterprise, 'by special invitation—nay,' says he, 'I have been driven to it.' What circumstances compel him to engage in such a warfare, he does not see fit to reveal. But he informs us that he would have begun the service a little sooner, had there not been one difficulty of rather a singular nature in the way, he could not determine *which party* of the common foemen to attack. It strikes me as passing strange that the learned Dr. should labor so earnestly and for such a length of time, as he did a twelve month since, and yet be undetermined on this point. Does he mean to confess that in his Lectures last year he had no definite object in view? Now, however, he has commenced the *attack*; for he has no idea, at present, he tells us, of standing on the *defensive*; he means to carry the war into the enemies' camp!—This is the language of valor, I acknowledge, but it has lost the charm it possessed a year since, when it was uttered, if I am not mistaken, by the same champion in relation to the same cause. Besides, who is so dull as as not to see that it is a very convenient and summary method for disposing of all that is past, and enabling one without the encumbrance and difficulty of retracting, explaining, conceding, and refuting, to commence a 'new series' of abuse? There may be a kind of dignity in this manner of treating opponents, but it is not the dignity of the gentleman and still less of the christian.

But what is this new attack upon Universalism, this war that is to be carried into our very camp? Why, thus far with very slight exceptions, a *repetition* only of the Lectures of last winter!—a repe-

tion of the same stale anecdotes, the same sophistical arguments, the same wholesale abuse. In short it is a repetition of the same attack which was made and met a year ago. During this year Dr. Brownlee has had opportunities of making himself acquainted with the doctrine he assailed. Many errors in his Lectures have been pointed out. Without reference to this he goes on now and repeats those very errors again, and gives them a wider circulation. I appeal to you, christian friends, if this is honest. Was it not his duty to suppress those statements altogether, or at least to offer as he has been repeatedly called upon to do, the proofs of their truth?

The fact that these Essays were in substance, the same as the Lectures which I examined through the Christian Messenger, rendered a repetition of my reply, unnecessary for the Universalist public. I felt anxious, however, to expose before you, some of the gross errors, in fact, and in argument, which those Essays contain. I therefore addressed the following note to the editors of the Christian Intelligencer.

For the Christian Intelligencer.

Messrs. Editors—

I have lately observed in the Christian Intelligencer, a series of articles over the signature W. C. B.; entitled "Essays on Universalism." The signature I recognize as the initials of the Rev. Dr. Brownlee. Several numbers have already appeared, and from the introductory Essay, I learn that it is the writer's design to present your readers with a critical examination of this system of faith. It is unnecessary for me to express the lively interest I feel in every discussion of this important subject, and the satisfaction I experience in seeing it attracting so much attention. But while I am gratified that Universalism is beginning to claim in our community, a portion of that consideration, which, whether true or false, it so justly deserves, I have to regret that its doctrines are still so generally misunderstood and misrepresented. Even in the Essays of your learned correspondent, so far as they have appeared, Universalists find much cause for complaint.

My object in now addressing you, is to ask the privilege of correcting, through your columns, some errors into which your correspondent has fallen, and also to point out some instances of what I regard false and inconclusive reasoning in his communications.

Your sense of justice, gentlemen, will, I doubt not, induce you to grant what I ask only as a favor, but what I might, perhaps, in behalf of my denomination, claim as a right. For surely the accused ought ever to enjoy the privilege of entering their defence at the very tribunal before which they are arraigned.

Should you comply with my request, which I think you must acknowledge a reasonable one, I shall trouble you with articles as brief as may be consistent with perspicuity, and justice to my subject, whenever leisure from indispensable duties, will permit. And I trust, that however widely I may differ from yourselves in opinion, you will find no occasion to complain of the spirit, which my communications shall manifest. The subject is certainly one of the most important upon which mortals can be addressed. And he who can so far forget its dignity and his own character, as to trifle upon a question that concerns the everlasting well-being of millions and millions of his fellow men, must have but slight claims upon the attention of mankind. I am, gentlemen, very respectfully,

Yours, THOMAS J. SAWYER.

This note was forwarded to the office of the Christian Intelligencer on the 22d Nov. In the Intelligencer of the 23d, which I received on the morning of its publication, I gladly noticed the following in an article headed "UNIVERSALISTS." Speaking of the editors of the Christian Messenger, it says,

"They observe a profound silence in regard to the Essays on Universalism published by us over the signature of a person with whom they have professed a great willingness to engage in controversy."

This short sentence contained at least one very sad mistake. Dr. Brownlee's Essays here alluded to had been noticed in the Christ. Mess. and ample extracts from the first had been made. The writer of the editorial article in the Intelligencer evidently desired to give his readers the impression that we

had now lost our *professed* willingness to engage in controversy with Dr. Brownlee; but he forgot to mention that we had already examined these very Essays while they yet retained the form of Lectures. Before the next week had elapsed the Intelligencer had materially changed its tone; for among the notices to correspondents was found the following:

"Mr. T. J. S.'s letter has been received. As soon as we have evidence that he is appointed the hero and exclusive defender of Universalism, by a vote of the different sects of that faith, we may open our columns to him; but not until then."

Being unable to understand this notice in such a manner as was worthy the conductors of a religious journal, a short time after wrote them the following letter.

Messrs. Editors—

On the 22d ult. I took the liberty of addressing you a letter, in which I asked the privilege of pointing out some errors in reasoning, and in fact, which appear in a series of articles published in your paper, over the signature of Dr. Brownlee, entitled, "Essays on Universalism." In the Intelligencer of Nov. 30, I observed the following notice to correspondents.

"Mr. T. J. S.'s letter has been received. As soon as we have evidence that he is constituted the hero and exclusive defender of Universalism, by a vote of the different sects of that faith, we may open our columns to him, but not until then."

I am somewhat at a loss, gentlemen, to understand the meaning of this notice. Your language seems very well calculated to induce your readers to suppose that I sought admission into your columns as "the hero and exclusive defender of Universalism;" and that you expressed a possibility of granting my request so soon as you should be put in possession of evidence that I had been raised to such dignity, 'by a vote of the different sects of that faith.' That you could wish to be so understood, is impossible, because you knew that I made no pretensions to such a character; but on the contrary, that I asked the favor of appearing in the Intelligencer, over my own name, and of course, with my individual responsibility.

Passing this, therefore, as a natural inference from your language, but which you could not design to be drawn, I am led to ask how you must be understood. You tell me that your columns *may* be open to me 'as soon as you have evidence that I am constituted the hero and exclusive defender of Universalism, by a vote of the different sects of that faith.' But were you sincere, in this guarded and half-way proposition? To answer this question in the affirmative, would, it seems to me, be a reflection upon your good sense. For you must have known that the conditions you proposed, were either impossible, or of such a character as no gentleman would consent to perform, even were they within his power.

If your learned correspondent is in error, as I think myself capable of proving to any reasonable man who will hear me, is it of any importance who corrects him? Must the individual who undertakes this task be "constituted the hero and exclusive defender of universalism, by a vote of the different sects of that faith?" The idea, gentlemen, appears to me too absurd to be indulged by you one moment. But farther: have you yet demanded of Dr. Brownlee, evidence that "he is constituted the hero and exclusive defender" of endless misery "by a vote of the different sects of that faith;" and the sole champion of their hosts to attack universalism? Let justice be done. Truth, with your superior advantages to defend it, has nothing to fear. And when you have brought into the field, an individual sustained by the different sects of your faith, I will pledge myself that he shall be met by one clothed with equal authority by those of mine. The case before us, however, is of a very different character. Dr. Brownlee, on his individual responsibility, has seen fit to attack universalism. You have lent him your columns. He has misrepresented the doctrines of Universalism, and abused its advocates. I ask the privilege of correcting his misrepresentations, and showing that his abuse is unmerited. When the accused have been heard in their own defence, your readers will be qualified to judge for themselves; and not until then.

Your notice must have been written very hastily

and altogether without reflection, 'I think, if you were sincere in your proposition. The considerations referred to above will inform you sufficiently why I think so. I am therefore driven to the only alternative, and infer that realizing the impossibility or unreasonableness of your conditions, your notice was designed as an *unconditional refusal* of my request. This is possible, but I am not prepared to believe it true. For in the first place if you intended utterly to refuse me, why not use unambiguous language to express your fixed determination? Why not say plainly that no Universalist should be admitted into your columns for any purpose whatever. But in the second place, such a refusal would be paying but a poor compliment to yourselves or your correspondent,—to your confidence in the truth of his assertions in relation to Universalists or the soundness of his arguments against their doctrines. For you could not but be aware that however you and your friends might regard it, the public would draw, and would be justified in drawing, the conclusion that you were fearful of the results of admitting any defence of Universalism in your columns.

Whatever may have been your meaning, gentlemen, in the notice alluded to, I confess myself unable to understand you in such a manner as is honorable to your good sense and candor. Pardon me for the trouble to which I put you, and believe me, I shall be grateful for any explanation you are pleased to make. Very respectfully yours,

T. J. S.

Three or four weeks have now passed since the above letter was left at the office of the Christian Intelligencer. As yet they have condescended to offer no explanation, to make no reply, and I think myself justified in concluding that they intend none.

Under all these circumstances am I not at liberty to form my own opinions of the editors' notice?—That they designed it as an *unconditional refusal* of my request, I think too obvious to be questioned. That it was accompanied with the approval of Dr. Brownlee is also evident. Such an editorial notice under any circumstances would hardly be inserted without advising with the writer whose articles it was proposed to examine. Besides, it is generally understood that Dr. Brownlee is one of the editors of the Christian Intelligencer. I therefore consider him implicated in this refusal. And you will allow me, christian friends, to ask how this must appear before the public? Will not the community be justified in believing that he is afraid, and therefore unwilling, to have his Essays examined? Will it not believe him conscious of having made assertions, of having employed arguments, which he cannot defend? Nay, will it not be justified in fearing, that he is willing to mislead you on a subject which it concerns your happiness to understand?

But, christian friends, will you contemplate for one moment the position which you sustain. You should entertain some feelings of self-respect. But how, let me ask you, are you treated? Even your partialities in favor of your religious teachers, it seems to me, cannot blind you to the humiliating fact, that they dare not trust you to your own enlightened judgment. They dare not allow you to obey the apostolic injunction, "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." Your knowledge of Universalism must be had through those only who have shown themselves its bitterest enemies. You must see it only in the light in which they are disposed to present it, and on this partial and distorted view, you must form your judgment. Nay, in plain words, you must pin your faith upon their sleeve, and think only as they think, and know nothing which they are not pleased to communicate. If this is worthy of you as enlightened christians, I have indeed misapprehended the spirit of christianity.

Finally, Christian friends, let me say in the language of Dr. Campbell, "'Tis error, not truth, vice, not virtue that fears the light." If Dr. Brownlee is confident of the goodness of his cause, why this shrinking from an examination? If the editors of the Christian Intelligencer have confidence either in their own, or their learned correspondent's ability to sustain the charges contained in his Essays, why close their columns, and refuse to Universalists the privilege granted to the greatest criminal on earth,—the privilege of being heard in his own defence?

(For conclusion see 7th page.)

Original.

THE BIBLE.

Of all books which deserve the serious and profound attention of all classes, the learned and unlearned, it is the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. It is the most ancient of all writings, sacred or profane. Says Calmet, "The Jewish scriptures were proved to be ancient, even eighteen hundred years ago." They were received by the Jews as of Divine authority, and as such were published and preserved.

The bible has been often attacked by men of genius and extensive erudition, and its defenders have as often successfully repelled their assaults. There appears to be a species of unaccountable malice in the minds of some men against the divine authority of this book. Miracles, prophecies, and all the supernatural phenomena are either pronounced to be a sheer forgery, or are accounted for on the score of legerdemain, jugglery, &c. And why? because they do not come precisely within the sphere of natural causes, or of their own comprehension. All the external and internal evidences, are either never investigated, or totally disregarded. Should we find a few things apparently objectionable in any generally received history, we are by no means justifiable in rejecting the whole as a fiction or imposture. Because we cannot understand or explain the transfiguration of Christ; his resurrection, ascension on high, &c. and many other miracles recorded, we should not be too hasty in affirming that these are mere fables; but let us remember that with God "nothing is impossible."

There are many persons, who have perused all the novels of the day, and can recount with tolerable facility the most prominent incidents contained in them, but never look into their bibles, (if one they have,) from the commencement of one year to another, and yet amongst this class there are many sceptics, who are probably as ignorant of the leading doctrines of the scriptures, as he who has never heard the name of Christ. To such I would say look into the oracles of divine truth, examine impartially and dispassionately; read all the collateral evidence drawn for its support and then judge.

An evidently injudicious course has been pursued by some parents in compelling their children to read the bible, before they have arrived at years when they are qualified to understand it, and the natural consequence is that in many instances, they acquire a rooted dislike, and when out of the reach of parental discipline, forsake it altogether. Let the bible be placed in the hands of young persons, when their understandings are in a degree matured, and it will be read with pleasure and profit. The history of the life and death of our Lord contains more interesting facts, and is better calculated to enlist the attention, than all the light reading with which the community is supplied. The story of Joseph and his brethren, is replete with interest and instruction. The providence of God is fully exemplified in a simple, unadorned narration, in preserving and raising up an individual who would exert a powerful influence on the fortunes of his family and their posterity.

The bible should not be read to find proof for our pre-conceived opinions, but to search for truth. What incalculable mischief has the plan adopted in our Sunday schools produced? A premium is frequently offered to a child who can but just read, to find a given number of texts, to prove a future general judgement, the trinity, eternal punishments, &c. Now this is totally wrong,—a passage of scripture, which may prove every thing, rather than the one intended, is wrested from its original import to prove something on which it has not the slightest bearing. Thus the youthful mind is choked and prevented forever from making advances in religious truth, and if it should ever make an effort to burst its

chains, it is more than probable it will find refuge in infidelity.

In reading the scriptures, we should be careful to observe the peculiar idiom of the age, in which it was written, learn where and for what purpose, and by whom it was written, and thus we shall escape the equally dangerous extremes of superstition and scepticism.

J. R.

Original.

A UNIVERSALIST PRAYER.

A zealous elderly Lady in conversation with a Universalist, observed that she did not believe that the Universalists ever prayed. She never heard one pray. The Universalist replied, that if she felt in a spirit of prayer, and desired him to pray, he would attempt to make a short plain closet prayer, after the manner that our Saviour directed his followers to pray. She signified her desire to hear him. The Universalist without hesitation proceeded as follows:

Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven; give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors; lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory, forever, AMEN.

O Lord, suffer thy unworthy servants to come before thee at this time to offer up our prayers and supplications unto thee, Lord, thou knowest all our wants, of every nature whatsoever, better than we can ask or think. Be kind to supply them out of the fullness of thy bounty, and all the praise, and thanksgiving shall be given to thee and thy son Jesus Christ.

O Lord, we desire to return all humble and hearty thanks for the many favors that we are daily receiving from thy hands. We desire to thank thee for the blessing of life, liberty, for health, and for strength, but above all for the free gift of the Gospel of our salvation, which thou hast sent to a lost and dying world of sinners. May it spread far and wide to the utmost bounds of the earth. May the whole human family see of thy salvation and be glorified. May truth run down our streets like a river; and error, darkness, and deception, vanish away like the dew before the rising sun.

O Lord, we desire to thank thee that our lot is cast in a land of gospel light and liberty, where we can worship God according to the dictates of our own consciences; where we can sit under our own vine and fig-tree, and there are none to make us afraid.

Lord wilt thou pardon and forgive us all our sins and iniquity, trespasses and backslidings; blot them out of the book of remembrance against us, and love us freely. Lord wilt thou heal the sick, comfort mourners, be a stay and a staff to the aged, and a guide to the youth; be the widow's God, a father to the fatherless, satisfy our poor with bread, and help and relieve the afflicted and distressed every where throughout the earth! And may the knowledge of God cover the earth as the waters do the sea, and the whole earth be filled with thy glory; may every knee be brought to bow, and every tongue to confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.

O Lord, look down upon us and bless us; bless our neighborhood and society; may we live together in love and in peace; may we grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; may we learn to do by others as we would have them do by us, and may we practice it in truth and fidelity; and while sojourning through this vain world, may we live lives of godliness and honesty; may we deal justly with our fellow men in every respect, and may we ever have a conscience void of offence, both towards God, and towards man.

Lord, wilt thou be with us through all the changing scenes of life; be with us in the hour of death; be our stay and support in that solemn hour, and when we come to die may we die in peace, and rest in the arms of a blessed Savior, and in the morning of the resurrection may we rise to a glorious state of immortality beyond the grave. All these favors we would ask in the worthy name of Jesus Christ. AMEN.

The Lady said she would never accuse Universalists of not praying again. R. E.

PURE RELIGION.

'Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and the widow in their affliction, and keep himself unspotted from the world.'

In this age, when the whole Christian world is split into a thousand sects; when religion is defined to consist in believing this creed, and worshipping God after that form, it is well to turn back to the Bible and look after the essentials of true and real piety.

And how expressive is the declaration of St. James! How severely does it rebuke the unholiness, contentions, the absurd dogmas, the fantastic rituals and solemn mockeries that have been interwoven with our modern systems of theology! How illy does our over heated enthusiasm harmonize with the mild and tranquil precepts of Jesus. How wretchedly does the fiery persecution of zealots follow after that charity which loveth all things! How little does the infallibility of the reformed priesthood resemble that humility, which is the surest passport into the kingdom of Heaven! What mischief does the blindness of bigotry and the madness of religious zeal bring on the heads of the innocent, and how many, by believing too much rather than too little, narrow down to their own sect that love which God meant for the world!

When the essentials of true piety are so much perverted as they are at the present day, when the principles of pure morality are at so low an ebb—when salvation is only to be granted to a few self-elected saints, it is consoling to recur to the promise 'that in every nation he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness is accepted of him.'—*Indp. Inq.*

FEMALE TEMPER.

It is particularly necessary for girls to acquire command of temper, because much of the effects of their powers of reasoning and of their wit, when they grow up, depend upon the gentleness and good humor with which they conduct themselves. A woman, who should attempt to thunder with her tongue, would not find her eloquence increase her domestic happiness. We do not wish that women should implicitly yield their better judgment to their fathers, or husbands; but let them support the cause of reason with all the *grace of female gentleness*.

A man, in a furious passion, is terrible to his enemies; but a woman in a passion is disgusting to her friends;—she loses all the respect due to her sex, and she has not masculine strength and courage to enforce any other kind of respect.

The happiness and influence of women both as wives and mothers, and indeed, in every relation, so much depend on their temper, that it ought to be most carefully cultivated. We should not suffer girls to imagine that they balance *ill humor* by some good quality or accomplishment; because, in fact, there are none which can supply the want of temper in the female sex.

Man's misery is not made up of any overwhelming evil, but of numerous unhappy incidents. It is a weak plant which is of quick growth, and early arrives at full bloom.

MESSENGER & UNIVERSALIST.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 4, 1834.

We are indebted to our highly valued correspondent Miss J. H. Kinney, for the following. It points to the only substantial riches we can hope or look for here, and he who possesses them in their purity is rich indeed. It needs however, no commendation from us.

THE PORTIONLESS.

Fair child of poverty, thy only dower
Is thy transcendent beauty, and the gift
Which nature throws but seldom in a vase
Of such exquisite workmanship—a heart,
Pure as the wreath round Appenine's cold brow,
And true, and gentle, as the the constant dove.

Thy dress is coarse and simple, and thy hands,
Though small and delicate, are sparkling not
With many costly diamonds. On thy brow
No band of woven brilliants tells the tale
Of lavish partiality. Thy hair,
In its dark flowing richness, boasteth not
Of pearl or ornament, save one wild flower,
Pluck'd from the sterile borders of a rock;
Fit emblem of thy lowliness and worth.

Oh, hast thou thought, young sister, on the lot
Of poverty's pale daughters—how they toil
And struggle on beneath the oppressive scorn,
The cold, unfeeling pride of haughty wealth?
Thy looks are sad. Thus early doth thy heart
Bleed 'neath the infliction of deriding power!
Yet cheer thee up! there is an antidote—
Thy Savior mingled with the lowly poor,
Thy Savior wore the peasant's humble garb,
Thy Savior had not where to lay his head,
Yet meekly did he bear the rich one's sneer,
Nor envied he their pompous luxuries.
And when the tempter offered to invest,
With princely honors, his uncrowned head,
He spurned the subtle sorcerer from his sight,
And gave at last his life to bless the poor.

Sweet sister, be thy youthful soul like his,
And may he give thee strength to bear alike
Temptation's arts and poverty's dark ills.
With heart unbent, unmoved, that thou may'st
know

Through life, that peace which wealth can never
give. J. H. K.
Sheshequin, Pa.

MISSIONARY SUCCESS.

We take the following paragraph from an address delivered by Dr. Skinner before a Missionary meeting lately held at the Andover Seminary where the Dr. is Professor.

"If we take the success of the Apostles, and of those modern Missionaries most like the Apostles in spirit, as our standard of judging, it must be obvious, I think, that the results of our efforts to evangelize the world, do not bear a just proportion to the efforts themselves. The visible means now in operation greatly exceed those which the first preachers of Christianity employed, but clearly the progress, which the gospel is making in heathen countries, is vastly inferior to what is made in their days. We should inquire for the cause of this. It is owing to some thing no doubt, and it concerns us to know what it is. Does it not arise from the misplaced confidence, which we repose in the sufficiency of the instruments we employ to secure the end proposed?"

We are heartily glad to see our Limitarian friends aware of the fact above stated, and disposed to inquire for its cause. We think the little success Missionary efforts meet with in the present age is not to be accounted for from the misplaced con-

fidence which is reposed in the sufficiency of instruments now employed. Had the Dr. turned to the "Andover Creed," he would have found the reason to be the plain fact that God has not elected so many of the heathen in this age as he did in the time of the Apostles, and without this election, every Calvinist knows salvation is impossible for the Creed declares, "that no means whatever can change the heart of a sinner." This we think a plain reason, which Dr. Skinner as a Professor in Andover should have rendered. Would it be of any service, we would suggest whether the gospel preached by modern Missionaries, is not materially different from that of the Apostles,—“another gospel.” If some of our learned men would seriously inquire into this subject, we doubt not the true reason of the monstrous disparity in the results of primitive and modern efforts, would be discovered. Let some experiments be made, if no other means will satisfy. Let Missionaries be instructed to preach more as they pray, and to employ the love of God more than the terrors of hell. In fine, let them be guided in their ministry more by the Bible and less by their creeds, and a few years we believe will enable them to see that the ways of God are higher and better than the ways of men. S.

THOMAS JEWETT,

Or "The Infidel Reclaimed."

We have been much pleased by the perusal of a narrative of this gentleman in relation to his religious experience. It was evidently designed as a home thrust at Universalism and Unitarianism, and with that view, we doubt not, it was copied by the Christian Intelligencer of New-York from the New Hampshire Observer in which it originally appeared. It shows as conclusively as Mr. Jewett's declaration can make it, that Universalism, Unitarianism and Deism or Infidelity are "substantially the same, relative to the fundamentals of religion." And what is more, Mr. Jewett has had great opportunities for becoming acquainted with this fact, so that his testimony is unquestionable. Besides, if he is, according to his own acknowledgement, a most credible witness. A glance at his narrative will convince any one of this. He informs us, that he was educated in the belief of the Scriptures as the word of God—that he was first led astray by the fallacious arguments of Winchester, whose sentiments he fully adopted—from this the transition was easy to what he calls Universalism, or "the disbelief of any future punishment," a scheme he says, "perfectly agreeable to the door of evil"—at 30 years of age he "tried to become an Atheist," but failing here, he settled down in Deism,—for a few years past he has assumed the name of Unitarian, for the honest reason that Universalism and Deism were unpopular—and now he is a genuine Congregationalist and believes in Calvinism. Now who will dare to question Mr. Jewett's declaration relative to the "pernicious tendency," the "corrupting influence" of Universalism and Unitarianism and especially to the fact that they are the same as Infidelity? There is one circumstance, however, which we had almost forgotten to mention, that has a slight bearing on the subject. It is alluded to in the following observation, Mr. Jewett says, "And here I honestly and soberly declare, that these several names [viz. Restorationist, Universalist, Deist, and Unitarian,] were assumed at different times as a mere disguise—as convenience or interest might require." That is, Mr. Jewett confesses that after all he never was either, but a real, downright, hypocrite, and a most unprincipled knave!! Truly the testimony of such a man against Universalism ought to be spread from Maine to Georgia. Why, it must be invaluable for demolishing error and building up the truth of God!

Seriously, are not our Limitarian friends ashamed of the despicable means to which they resort to throw odium on religious sects which happen to differ from themselves? In the name of all that is holy, brethren, if you revere christianity, do not oppose us with the pitiful trash, the contemptible revilings of such practiced hypocrites as Thomas Jewett. If you wish to be classed with such men, hail him as your brother in the faith, echo his confession of shame through the whole land, tell the story of his hypocrisies and persuade even your own friends if you can, that he has not now assumed your name as a mere disguise, because others are unpopular, and because, his convenience or interest requires it. Remember the proverb, "A man is known by the company he keeps." S.

THE DIFFERENCE.

In looking over one of the religious papers of the city (New-York) we met with some comments on the Duke of Brunswick's "fifty reasons why the Roman Catholic religion ought to be preferred to all others." After some very playful observations, (which, did we not meet them in the paper and over the initials that we do, we might very rationally attribute to one who has lately become somewhat celebrated as a witty controversialist,) the "fiftieth reason" is introduced as follows:

"After going on about something else, he (the Duke of B.) says, 'Besides that, the Catholics, to whom I spoke concerning my salvation, assured me that, if I were to be damned for embracing the Catholic faith, they were ready to answer for me at the Day of Judgment, and to take my damnation upon themselves: an assurance I could never extort from the ministers of any sect, in case I should live and die in their religion. From whence I inferred, the Roman Catholic faith was built on a better foundation, than any of those sects that have divided from it.'"

Our writer is then at considerable loss "whether to make any comment on this reason or not," but finally he proceeds as follows:

"But let us look at it a minute. It seems the Duke was won over by the generosity of the Catholics. They agreed that if he were to be damned for embracing their faith (they admit the possibility that he might be; whereas the Protestant ministers whom he consulted, were too well assured of the truth of their religion to allow of the supposition) they would take his place and be damned for him. Now I wonder the Duke had not reflected—(but there are stupid Dukes—this was a nobleman, but not one of nature's noblemen) that those very Catholics, who made him this generous offer, if their faith was false, would have to be damned for themselves! That which should leave him without a title to heaven, would equally leave them without one. I wonder the Duke so readily believed that the substitution would be accepted. What if they were willing to suffer perdition in his place! The Judge might object to the arrangement. What ignorance and stupidity it manifests to suppose that one may suffer in hell for another, just as one serves in the army for another! What an idea such persons must have of the nature of future punishment, to suppose that it is transferable! I should like to know how one man is to suffer remorse for another. And again, what an admirable exemplification of the spirit of christianity, that one should consent on any condition to lie in hell forever sinning, and blaspheming God! I am sincerely glad that no Protestant minister could be found to give his consent to an eternity of enmity against God. But the Catholics whom the Duke consulted—they loved the Lord so, that they were willing to sin against Him forever and ever with ever-increasing malignity of opposition, for the sake

of saving their noble proselyte! 'FROM WHENCE I INFERRED, says the Duke, (but you have no capitals large enough for this conclusion) the Roman Catholic faith was built on a better foundation, than any of those sects that have divided from it.' Admirable dialectician! He must be *Aristotle* himself by metempsychosis."

We have not the least intention whatever of interfering with the 'interminable' strife now going on between that portion of Limitarians styled Protestants, and those claiming to be 'the faithful,' for it is indisputable, that they are all of the same family, and he who meddles with 'family quarrels' is sure to get no thanks for his pains. We may, however, here just observe, that the writer possesses a peculiar faculty of dealing out *pleasantry* on a subject of such awful concern; for it should be remembered, that if true to his creed, he believes that a vast number of the human race will at all events be *damned*. And it must be a very *merry* consideration to the *christian*, in the case of the Duke for instance, that after a firm reliance on the Catholic religion and the assurances of its Priests for salvation therein, it is found that the Priests are themselves to be *damned*, for themselves, and the Duke of course along with them. Perhaps as mirthful as in the case of a celebrated Divine, of recent occurrence, who was laboring hard to establish in the minds of his auditors the 'strict eternity of punishment.' Either being destitute of serious arguments for his purpose, or possessing an uncontrollable spirit of *trifling* where seriousness above all other considerations was demanded, he would throw all his powers of witticism upon every important point of the subject, as the only apparent method of destroying every argument for the final restoration of all to holiness and happiness, with which he met, while a vast number of his poor mistaken followers, absorbed in considerations of the greatness of their teacher, would sit and enjoy every laughable turn that he gave, with as much apparent zest as they would listen to some musical pettifogger, and repeatedly testify their interest by an almost audible buzz of laughter.

Reader, what a subject for mirth! A Christian audience—yea, a professed christian teacher himself—exulting over his apparent success in proving an eternity of the most excruciating tortures for the great proportion of mankind! Rather should there be wailing through that audience, and horror depicted on that preacher's countenance at the bare prospect of the consequences, he has conjured up before them.

The writer in the last paragraph quoted above thinks it a strange exemplification of a christian spirit to 'consent on any condition to lie in hell forever, sinning and blaspheming God.' He rejoices that no Protestant could be found to consent to it. Friendly reader, how long is it, (we know not but it is even so now) since it was an unyielding condition in the Limitarian faith, that one *should be willing to be damned for the glory of God, before he could hope to experience the joys of salvation!* The Catholics, this writer farther says, loved the Lord so that they were willing to sin against him forever, &c. to save their noble proselyte; and where is the mighty difference between them and those of his own faith? The difference, if any where, would seem to be much in favor of the Catholic, for while the other is prompted to this willingness to be *damned*, (and this is defined as sinning against God with 'ever increasing malignity') through a principle of *selfishness*—that is, the individual must be *willing* to go to hell to save himself—the Catholic is prompted by a more noble and expansive feeling, *a willingness to be damned to save another—a fellow creature!*

There is another reflection connected with this subject. The writer is undoubtedly a full believer in the literal and perfect substitution of Christ, and

yet he 'wonders that the Duke could so readily believe that the substitution (in his case) would be accepted.' He believes unquestionably that Christ fully paid the debt due divine justice, for every one at least that believes and repents, in their room and stead, and that eternal punishment is the just penalty of transgression, and still he thinks those persons must have strange ideas of future punishment, who 'suppose it transferrable.' What if the judge should object to the arrangement. What ignorance (he says) and stupidity, to suppose one may suffer in hell for another, just as one would serve in an army for another! And he desires above all things to know how one person is to suffer *remorse* for another?

Now these all appear to be rational queries—they struck us forcibly in reading the article; and still we have a strong presentiment that if they had been penned by a known Universalist they would have been unqualifiedly condemned, so much does 'circumstances alter cases.' And we see not why every query does not revert back, with equal force, upon the writer himself.

But we need not extend our remarks. The reader can examine for himself and follow out these general hints, if they are of any interest to him, and if they are not, we of course have said enough already. 'Happy is he who condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth.' P.

LANCASTER, PA.

In a recent number of this paper, I stated that I visited, and delivered two discourses in the city of Lancaster, in the early part of November ult. It appears that the testimony created "no small stir" in that region; and many were disposed to say, "These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also." In this state of affairs, it was deemed advisable, yea necessary, to send for a certain champion of the Partialist army, to the end that this "damnable heresy" of Universalism might be exposed, refuted and exploded. It seems that the clergy resident in the city of Lancaster, were afraid to attempt a refutation of "the Everlasting Gospel"—else they would stepped boldly forward and commenced the work, instead of giving the more zealous opponents of Universalism time to despatch a messenger for the champion before referred to.

Public notice was given through the papers, that "Rev." Mr. Ayres would preach in the Court House on the evenings of the 11th and 12th ult. from certain passages of Scripture,—mentioning the texts from which I had discoursed about six weeks previously. The object obviously was, to put down the heresy, viz. "the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began."

The writer hereof felt it his duty to be present. Accordingly he took stage, and arrived in Lancaster about dusk of the evening on which the first discourse was to be delivered by Mr. A. News of the arrival of "Satan" was speedily spread through the city; and it came to pass, that "when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, Satan came also among them." The people of Lancaster will understand, that this quotation, &c. has reference to one of the sermons delivered by Mr. A.

The champion began by telling the people that he came for "the purpose of blowing up the magazine of Universalism"—that he should deliver four sermons,—one in the Court House, and three in the Lutheran Church—that he was ready to discuss the question, "Will all men be finally saved?" in any of the periodicals of Lancaster—that he intended to root Universalism up, &c. &c. All this he said in a very boasting tone and manner, and then proceeded to deliver a discourse of three hours in length.

In the close (as during the delivery) of the harangue, he defied contradiction, challenged refutation, &c.

I rose, feeling it my duty so to do, and asked permission to make a few remarks. Liberty was peremptorily refused, at first, but afterwards granted, with the understanding that I should not then attack the Sermon, &c. I proceeded to say, that I was prepared to prove that the speaker had added to the words of the Book, and that God would add to him the plagues written therein; that he was either grossly ignorant of the doctrine of Universalism, or that he had wilfully and wickedly misrepresented it; that he was guilty of the grossest scurrility, &c., and that if I did not prove all I had stated, I would make suitable acknowledgements. I farther stated, that I would meet the speaker, or any clergymen of the city of Lancaster, in a public oral debate of the question, "Is the doctrine of endless misery taught in the Scriptures?"—that this was the best and indeed the only way of placing both sides of the question before the people—and that I publicly challenged an acceptance of the proposal. This was declined, expressly. I then pronounced the speaker *a spiritual coward*, who would not, and dared not, face the doctrine of Universalism in a fair debate.—The tokens of approbation of my procedure, manifested, in a manner that no one could misunderstand, by more than three fourths of the people, plainly showed that "an open field and fair play," was, in their estimation, what every man has a right to claim.—The words "Tekel," and "Ichabod," were plainly written on the foreheads of the combatant and his abettors, and the meeting was dismissed.

Next day, I attended the three discourses delivered in the Lutheran Church. Here the gag system was the order of the day. I was denied the privilege of giving notice that on the subsequent evenings I should reply in the Court House to the discourses that had been delivered. Notice however, was given, by my request.

On Friday evening, the Court House was crowded to excess, at an early hour. Mr. Lednum, the Methodist Clergyman of Lancaster, was present, and by my invitation took a seat with me on the judge's bench. After I concluded my discourse, liberty was given for a reply. Mr. L. made a few remarks—but soon gave up the matter.—On Saturday evening, a second discourse was delivered, and notice given that I should preach again on the evenings of Monday and Tuesday following. Monday came,—but the Commissioners locked the door of the Court House! They would not allow me an opportunity to answer for myself. The people of Lancaster will know how to estimate their liberality, not to say their justice.

The use of the Court House being refused, and as no other suitable place could be obtained, it was found necessary to adjourn a farther consideration of the matter until next spring. We shall then occupy God's church, which has neither bolts nor bars. We shall preach in the open air. Let the illiberal christians of Lancaster remember, that the light of truth is dawning in its resplendent glory on a darkened world. It is more than probable that there will be a Free Church in the city of Lancaster ere 18 months shall have passed away.

I would remark in conclusion, that never was such a religious excitement known in Lancaster county, as exists there at the present.

N. B. If there be an Editor in the city of Lancaster who is willing to admit a theological controversy into the columns of his paper, he will confer a lasting favor by giving me information of the fact.

A. C. T.

"STATEMENT OF FACTS."

(Concluded from 3d page.)

There is something wrong, grossly wrong here. This is not the open conduct of men who love the truth better than their party, and who had rather suffer injustice than be unjust themselves.

I leave the subject with you, only adding that in all the labors of Dr. Brownlee and his condutors against Universalism, not one step has been taken, not one effort has been made to convert Universalists from their fatal errors. On the contrary, they shun our pulpit, and our paper, while their abuse is lavishly poured into your attentive ear, to which we can with difficulty gain access. "I speak as unto wise men."

T. J. SAWYER.

EXPOSITOR.

The closing number of the 3d volume of this interesting and valuable work has been received.—The object of this brief article is not to laud the labors of the Editor and his correspondents. They only who have attentively perused the pages of the Expositor can be properly sensible of its value. I can only say, that I would not be without it for five times the price of subscription.

I am sorry to perceive that the Proprietors "are compelled to suspend the work, through want of patronage. They purpose, however, to make some arrangement, in order to resume it, if possible, and to proceed with another volume, in the course of a few months; of which reasonable notice will be given through the weekly papers of our denomination."

The question is—and I propose it to be remembered and practically answered—Shall the Expositor be sustained? To which I add, Shall the Proprietors suffer pecuniary loss? Shall the editor fail to receive the recompense he so richly deserves? I wish to hear an affirmative answer to the first question, and a negative to the two last.

What shall be done? Ans. Let every one who feels himself able so to do, subscribe for the work, and pay the money in advance. To which I beg leave to append the following proposal:—

Let each ministering brother (who feels that he can do so without injury to himself) agree to purchase 3 or 6 bound copies of each volume, so soon as completed. In this case, the proprietors would go on their way rejoicing—and the ministers would suffer no pecuniary loss. They could not fail to dispose of the copies at cost price, \$2. What if the copies should remain on hand a year or two?—they would eventually find purchasers. The work will yet be prized as it ought to be, and many will "seek" for the first volumes and "not be able to find." Will Br. Bazin, on behalf of himself and others, speak out in relation to this proposal? I, for one, will continue to purchase 6 bound copies of each volume. And Br. S. W. Fuller authorizes me to say, that he will purchase a like number of each volume that may hereafter be published.

A. C. T.

UNIVERSAL RESTITUTION.

I recently purchased at auction, a book entitled, "UNIVERSAL RESTITUTION vindicated against the CALVINISTS: In Five Dialogues." It was published in Bristol, (England,) 1773, and contains 176 large octavo pages, close print. The author's name is not given. It is a dialogue between "Witfeltius" on the part of Calvinism; and "Huber," on the part of Universalism. The author was obviously a learned man. He advocates Universal Restitution on the system of Relly and Murray—that is, Calvinism Improved. I purpose furnishing some extracts for publication.—Is it an unreasonable conjecture, that *Whitfield* is intended by the name "Witfeltius," and that *Vidler*, or *Relly*, as "Huber," was the author of the book? What says Br. T. W.?

A. C. T.

We are happy in being able to announce to our friends that Br C. F. Le Fevre, of Troy, has received and accepted an invitation to become pastor of the 3rd Universalist Society in New-York. He is expected to commence his pastoral labors during the month of March next. This Society, although of but few months standing, has already become highly respectable both for numbers and character. Its great prosperity indicates very clearly the progress of Universalism in New-York. Br. Le Fevre will bring to its farther upbuilding talents, experience and reputation. May the Great Head of the Church smile on the connexion now formed, and make it one of mutual satisfaction and happiness. S.

EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE.

Last saturday's number closed the fourth volume of the Evangelical Magazine and Gospel Advocate, new series. The number of this date commences the fifth volume. The Magazine and Advocate is published every Saturday at \$1, 50 in advance, \$2 if not paid within six months, and \$2, 50 if not paid within the year. The Magazine sustains a high reputation, and justly so, in our order, and possesses the largest subscription of any of our Periodicals, (we believe nearly or quite 8000.) It has ever been, under its present conductors, (we know nothing of it before) an able "Advocate" of the pure doctrines of Christianity, and has been unquestionably of incalculable benefit in advancing our cause, through the Northern and Western sections of this state particularly. We wish its worthy conductors success commensurate with their exertions to advance the cause of truth. P.

CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

Not, kind reader, the Christian Intelligencer of New York, but the Christian Intelligencer of Gardiner, Me. a valuable and interesting paper, devoted to our cause and edited by our worthy Br. Drew, has just closed its *thirteenth* volume, (7th vol. new series.) The Intelligencer we have always, since our acquaintance with it, regarded as one of our most staid and stable publications, pursuing that even tenor of its way which will inevitably, sooner or later, command respect. It is published every Friday, in Gardiner, Me. by Joseph D. Lord and Co. at \$2,50 per annum, which can be cancelled for \$2 in advance. We wish its publishers and editor abundant success. P.

"Statement of Facts."

We shall strike off a quantity of extra papers, of the present number, for the purpose of supplying those who may wish it, with the "Statement of Facts," addressed to the members of the Reformed Dutch Church, which commences on the 1st page. P.

Some reflections on the closing year and commencement of the new, designed for this number, have been unavoidably crowded by, from the fact of other articles being in type, and the hurry of business compelling us to take them in order to get up our paper in season.

Original.

Choose ye this day whom ye will serve.

"For as in Adam all die; even so in Christ shall all be made alive." This is Universalism. "For as in Adam all die; even so in Christ shall the elect only be made alive." This is Calvinism.

For as in Adam all die; even so in Christ shall all true believers only be made alive." This is Arminianism.

Reader, if you believe the first you ought to profess and support it as the truth of God. If you believe the second or third you ought not to

say the Bible contains it, for it contains no such sentiment; and by saying it does contain it, you virtually charge God with having said what his word does not contain. Beware, lest ye be found fighting against God! S. W. F. Philadelphia.

PEACE.

No name is more sweet and lovely than that of peace; 'it is the calm of the world, the smile of nature; it is the harmony of all those well-toned airs which are struck from melodious instruments.' Peace is the fruit of holiness; and a greater glory cannot be shed over the land, than is shed when righteousness and peace meet together and kiss each other.

When the reception of the gospel of peace becomes universal, when every heart is inspired with its tranquilizing spirit, this earth will be a blooming paradise—a heaven where will reign pure and uncorrupted love.—*Universalist*.

To Correspondents.

Our thanks to Br. S. W. Fuller, for his favors. We had only room for a short article this week.—The "Candid reply to an uncandid Letter," will have a place as early as we can possibly make room for it.

"W. W." on "Judgment," is again welcome.

Our respected sister J. H. K. has again laid us under obligation, for a continuation of "Contrasted Scenes." It will have an early place.

MARRIED.

In the city of New-York, on the 26th ult. by Rev. T. J. Sawyer Mr. William Glover and Miss Elizabeth Sherwin, both of Norwalk Ct.

On the evening of the 22d ult. by the Rev. T. J. Sawyer, Mr. Denmark Collins and Miss Margaret Osgood, all of New-York.

On Saturday evening 28th Dec. by the Rev. A. Maclay, Mr. Rinier Mooney and Miss Caroline Ashton.

In New-York on the 31st ult. by the Rev. T. J. Sawyer, Mr. Marcus Bassett and Miss Mary L. Rogers both of New Haven, Conn.

In Philadelphia, on Sunday Evening last, by Ev. A. C. Thomas, Mr. Barclay Jackson to Miss Sarah Rickards, both of Southwark.

DIED.

In Royalton Vt. Dec. 2d, Dea. DANIEL FULLER, aged 86. Mr. Fuller was a member of the Congregational Church in Royalton, probably for more than fifty years, and a deacon of the same church more than thirty years.

He naturally possessed strong intellectual faculties, enriched with the noble desire for doing good. Though, by the force of education, he for many years, gave his assent to partial creeds, yet his love was universal, and he was universally beloved. Through the course of life, he was firm in integrity, honest in principle, maintaining the strictest adherence to moral deportment. Towards the close of his life, by reading the scriptures, his mind was raised above all partial creeds, and embraced the glorious doctrine of universal love and salvation. And, notwithstanding his former friends and brethren in the church, whilst he lay on his death bed, (although unable to say ought against him, save his belief,) raised a cry of *heresy*, and threatened him with *excommunication*, telling him they should treat him, "as a heathen man and a publican," if he did not retract his steps and again embrace his former faith; he railed not a word, but remained firm, glorying in the thought, that the love of God is boundless, and, that 'in the dispensation of the fullness of times he will gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him.'—*Universalist Watchman*.

RELIGIOUS NOTICES.

Br. S. J. Hillyer will preach in Hightstown, Jan. 5th; in Saugutuck Jan. 12th and in the evening at the school house near John Mallory's.

PAUL BEFORE THE AREOPAGUS.

Come to the Hill of Mars, for he is there,
That wondrous man, whose eloquence doth touch
The heart like living flame. With brow unblanch'd
And eye of fearless ardor, he confronts
That high tribunal, with its pen of flint,
Whose irreversible decree must pale
The Gentile world. All Athens gathers near—
Fickle and warm of heart, and fond of change.
And full of strangers, and of those who pass
Life in the idle toil, to hear or tell
Of some new thing. See hither throng the bands
Of Epicurus, wrapt in gorgeous robe,
Who seem with bright and eager eyes to ask,
'What will this babbler say?' With front austere
Stand a dark group of stoics, sternly proud,
'And predetermined to confute, but still
Neath the deep wrinkles of their settled brow,
Lurk some unwonted gathering of their powers
As for no common foe. With angry frown
Stalk the fierce cynics, anxious to condemn,
And prompt to punish; while the patient sons
Of gentle Plato bid the listening soul
To search for wisdom, and with reason's art
Build the fair argument.

Behold the throngs
Press on the speaker, drawing still more close,
In denser circles, as his thrilling tones
Speak of the God who warneth every where
Men to repent, and of that fearful day
When he shall judge the world. Loud tumult
wakes,
The tide of strong emotion hoarsely swells,
And that blest voice is silenced. They have mocked
The ambassador of heaven, and he departs
From their wild circle. But his graceful hand
Points to an altar with its mystic scroll—
'The unknown God.'

Ah, Athens, is it so?
Thou who didst crown thyself with woven rays
As a divinity, and calledst the world
Thy pilgrim worshipper, dost thou confess
Such ignorance and shame? *The unknown God!*
While all thy hillocks and resounding streams,
Yea, every heart that beats within thy walls,
May choose its temple and its priestly train,
Victim and garland, and appointed rite;
Thou mak'st the gods of every realm thine own,
Fostering with boundless hospitality
All forms of idle worship. Can it be
That still ye found not him who is near
To every one of us,—in whom we live,
And move and have a being? He of whom
Thy tuneful poets spake with childish awe!
And thou Philosophy, whose art refined
Did aim to pierce the labyrinth of fate,
And compass with thy fine spun sophist web
This mighty universe, didst thou fall short
Of the upholding cause?

The unknown God!
Thou who did'st smile to find an awe-struck world
Crouch to thee as a pupil, wert thou blind?
Blinder than he who in his humble cot,
With hardened hand, his daily labor done,
Turneth the page of Jesus, and doth read
With toil, perchance, that the trim school-boy
mocks,
Counting him in his arrogance a fool;
Yet shall this poor wayfaring man lie down
With such a hope as thou couldst never teach
The kinglike sages: yea, a hope that plucks
The sting from death—the victory from the grave.
Hartford, Conn. L. H. S.

Religious Souvenir.

WINTER.

"By the breath of God, frost is given."

The cheerless season of winter is as full of instruction to the religious and thinking man as the other seasons. All in magnificent succession awaken the purest sentiments of piety in the human heart. The living and exhilarating green of Spring—the genial and joyous warmth of Summer—the grateful abundance of Autumn, and even the inclemency of hoary Winter—each suggest their appropriate topics of gratitude to Him, who from his throne on high "remembereth the things which are in heaven and on earth." Perhaps we learn the most ennobling lessons of religion from the storms and clouds of Winter. The gay variety of nature is no more—the cloudless throng of the gaudy flowerets of

Summer are all returned to their native dust; the gay livery of earth is hidden from our sight by a snowy mantle, and even the light of the sun himself is obscured. Driven thus from the contemplation of things external, we turn to higher and better objects of thought. Other seasons draw our attention to the earth we inhabit—but this exhibits to our wondering eyes myriads of other worlds and naturally leads the mind to the contemplation of heavenly things. * * * *

No language (Revelation excepted,) is so plain and so readily understood as the language of Nature, and at no season does she speak so forcibly and solemnly to the heart as in the season of Winter. She tells us in the buried flowers—in the icy stiffness of the trees—in the snowy covering of the fair and beautiful vines of summer—of decay written by the finger of God upon all his works. We are thus warned that as wave succeeds to wave, so generation succeeds to generation and that we must soon mingle with our native dust. The little prattler of to-day soon fills our place in society, and the tendrils of earthly affection are severed at our departure only to be transferred to our successors. But it teaches us a nobler lesson—it tells us that the buried vine, will soon in renewed beauty wave its delicate leaves in the breath of Summer, and the icy-mantled trees soon put forth their strength and beauty, and that we too, having left our chrysalis shell to moulder in its native earth, shall wing our flight to worlds above. "The mighty resurrection of nature has been these six thousand years, annually giving to men its eloquent teachings," and in it we have an almost assured pledge of a resurrection. A thousand years are to the Eternal but as one day, and the glorious powers he thus annually exerts are not yet marred—nor are even subject to decay. He has thus also taught us that while every natural object seemed dead, the principle of vegetable life was still unceasingly operating and preparing silently this earthly resurrection—and that in his wise government there exists no evil.

"When gathering clouds around we view,
"And days are dark and friends are few—
He tells us in the voice of Nature to look upward for support and consolation—that no enemy hath done this, but that if an additional mantle of icy grief is thrown over us it is only to assist the "principle of life" in so renovating the system as to prepare it for its glorious resurrection. The year of nature is an emblem of the year of the soul; and while we see the wisdom of present evil to the plants and trees of the earth, shall we not also believe in the wisdom of afflictions to the soul? While the natural objects of sense are annually dying, man still lives and sees the beginning, life and end of myriads of the inanimate creatures of God. Of the innumerable eyes which open upon Nature, none but those of man see its author and its end.

Let then the storms of Winter blow, and the icy mantle still cover the earth: they are the signs of the same Father who beautifies the Spring and the Summer, and "crowns the year with his goodness." They are to us evidences of that kind hand which makes "the momentous evil productive of final good," and teaches us to look through Nature to its God. * * * *

Wesleyan Journal.

THE HOLIDAYS.

Again, in the ever-returning round of anniversaries and seasons set apart for mutual enjoyment and congratulation, we are called upon to bestow a passing notice on the christmas holidays and the opening of the new-year. With what a feeling of exhilaration, with what emotions of delight do we greet the approach of these pleasant spots in the tedious and toilsome journey of life—these green oases, whose inviting shelter, fraught with sweet content, makes us forget the wearisome fatigues of past labors,

and invigorates body and mind for future struggles in the onward path of our destiny. Yet are not these times unaccompanied with associations of sober and melancholy reflection. In the quaint and beautiful language of Charles Lamb, each one of us has two birthdays: that which we call especially *our own*, and that which we may truly name the nativity of the original Adam and all his race. Though we may have first opened our eyes upon terrestrial things when the raging dog-star blazed, and nature fainted beneath its furnace-atmosphere, still the new year's birthday, with its icy breath and snowy mantle, seems more peculiarly *our own*, and we feel more solemnly impressed with a sense of the lapse of time and our own advancement along the lengthening and declining road whose milestones are years, than we could be though the instant marking the addition of our insignificant selves to the millions of the human family were celebrated with oriental magnificence—though trumpets and cannons pealed with reverberating echoes, and nations shouted to commemorate it. The one is the rejoicing of an individual, the other the jubilee of a world—the one may be heralded by the petty illuminations of evanescent lights, but the great luminaries of heaven, with their celestial phenomena, usher in the other. Who is there so insensible as not to be affected, although but for a moment, when he beholds a unit added to the amount of years he has so often written before his business accounts, his correspondence, and perchance those intercommunications between his heart and another's, which are the strongest and brightest links in the chain of affection and love; and who so bereft of all imagination as not to feel the force of the beautiful line of the poet,

"I saw the skirts of the departing year."

* * * * *
New-York Mirror.

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER

AND

PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

In presenting proposals for the third vol. of the Messenger it is merely necessary to say, that no essential change will be made in the course of the paper, unless it be to avail ourselves of every possible opportunity of increasing the talent and interest in its columns. It will, therefore, in the language it has ever held forth, to the world, continue to "plead the cause of a slandered and persecuted denomination of Christians—the UNIVERSALISTS;" endeavor to inspire confidence among its friends, and to induce as far as possible the thoughtless and unconcerned, and even opposers, to come forward into the field of examination and "reason together" on the great and glorious doctrines of a *world's reconciliation to God.*

CONDITIONS.

The "N. Y. Christian Messenger and Philadelphia Universalist," is published simultaneously in New-York and Philadelphia every Saturday morning, on a royal sheet, quarto form, and close print, at \$2 per annum, *in advance*, or \$2.50 if not paid within the first 6 months.

Subscribers in New-York and Philadelphia will be promptly served by carriers, and all possible care will be observed in the Mailing department, that subscribers may regularly receive their papers.

The publishing office in New-York is at No's. 2 and 3 Marble Building, Chatham Square, and in Philadelphia, for the present, at No. 132 Chesnut-street adjoining the United States Bank.

P. PRICE, Publisher and Proprietor.

P. PRICE, PRINTER,

Nos. 2 and 3 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square where JOB PRINTING will be neatly executed, on reasonable terms. Orders solicited.